

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 4. This sheet, which only includes FIG. 4, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 4. In FIG. 4, previously omitted reference line 3-3 has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Applicants hereby acknowledge the Office Action mailed January 12, 2006 and submit herewith a petition for a one-month extension of time, the cost of which is to be debited from Deposit Account No. 13-2855. Claims 2-7, 12-15 and 18 are currently pending. Claims 2-7 and 12-15 are currently amended. In light of the above-identified amendments and following remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action indicated that claims 12 and 18 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Without conceding the merits of the objections, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 has been rewritten to include the language of now cancelled claim 1 and each intervening claim from which it previously depended. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 was originally in independent form and therefore the objection of claim 18 is improper. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 12 and 18 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections.

Request to Withdraw Restriction Requirement

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' election without traverse of claims 1-12 and 16-18. Additionally, in light of the amendments to the claims made herein and the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that previously non-elected claims 13-15 currently depend from allowable claim 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the restriction requirement be withdrawn with respect to claims 13-15. In the event the Examiner denies this request, Applicants would be prepared to authorize cancellation of claims 13-15, reserving the right to file a divisional application directed to these claims. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13-15 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable claim 12.

Drawing Objections

The drawings stand objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they did not include reference line 3-3, which is mentioned on page 5, line 1 of the specification. Applicants submit herewith a “Replacement Sheet” of drawings in accordance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), in which reference line 3-3 has been added to FIG. 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 stands objected to for allegedly unclearly reciting “...in an elongated slot formed in one of the front of the inclined sheet...” Without conceding the merits of the rejection, Applicants submit that claim 7 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim “...in an elongated slot formed in the front of the inclined sheet ...” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, claims 2-12 stand rejected as reciting an “adapter” in the preambles thereof, which allegedly lacked antecedent basis.

Applicants submit that the preambles of claims 2-7 and 12 have been amended to particularly point out and consistently and distinctly recite an “apparatus” instead of an “adapter.” Additionally, Applicants submit that claims 8-11 have been canceled herein, thereby rendering the rejection, as pertaining to claims 8-11, moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Spamer (U.S. Patent No. 4,454,948). Claim 1 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Vineyard (U.S. Patent No. 2,218,444).

Applicants submit that claim 1 has been canceled herein, thereby rendering these rejections, as pertaining to claim 1, moot. Additionally, claim 2 has been amended herein to

be dependent on allowable claim 12 and, therefore, should also be allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Vineyard in view of Spamer. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Vineyard in view of Spamer and in further view of Primiano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,670). Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Vineyard in view of Spamer, in further view of Primiano et al., and in further view of Valilulis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,531,417). Claims 3 and 4 further stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Spamer in view of Primiano et al. Claims 8-10 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Spamer in view of Dolling (U.S. Patent No. 5,779,064). The Examiner takes official notice to allege that claim 17 stands rejected as being “obvious and inherent within the structure defined by the Spamer in view of Dolling reference.”

Applicants submit that claims 8-10, 16 and 17 have been canceled herein, thereby rendering these rejections, as pertaining to claims 8-10, 16 and 17, moot. Additionally, as provided above, claims 2-7 have been amended to be dependent on allowable claim 12 and, therefore, should also be allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Rejection of Claim 11

As stated above, claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly being indefinite. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action neither makes a substantive rejection of claim 11 nor does it indicate claim 11 as being allowable. Therefore, Applicants submit that, although claim 11 has been canceled herein, claim 11 contains allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants reserve the right to pursue protection of the subject matter of claim 11 in a continuation or divisional application based on the present application.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, Applicants believe that all stated grounds for rejection and/or objection have been either traversed, accommodated or rendered moot and, therefore, respectfully request prompt and favorable consideration of the presently pending application. In addition to the cost for the one-moth extension mentioned above, Applicants believe that no further fees are necessary, however, if the Patent Office deems otherwise, Applicants hereby authorize the Office to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment Deposit Account No. 13-2855. Finally, if the Examiner believes for any reason that a telephone conversation will expedite the prosecution of the present application to allowance, Applicants invite that Examiner to telephone the undersigned at (312) 474-6300.

Dated: May 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jeremy R. Krieger

Registration No.: 39,257
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicants

Attachments